DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 942 RC 011 117

AUTHOR Jess, James D.
TITLE Revitalizing Rural Education and Small Schools in Iowa. A Position Paper Prepared for the House and Senate Education Committee of the 68th General Assembly, First Session.
PUB DATE 25 Jan 79
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classification; Declining Enrollment; Delivery Systems; *Educational Finance; *Guidelines; Organization; *Rural Education; School Districts; School Services; *School Size; *Small Schools; *State Legislation; Teacher Education; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa

ABSTRACT

During 1976-77, 42% of U.S. schools operated with fewer than 600 pupils and 27% operated with fewer than 300 pupils; Iowa had 181 K-12 public school systems with fewer than 300 pupils in 1977-78. All of Iowa's smaller school systems were located in the more sparsely populated rural areas of the state, had higher than average per pupil assessed valuations and per pupil expenditures, and received lesser amounts of state aid per pupil. The gap in salaries for experienced and more highly degreed teachers in the smaller versus the larger districts had become appreciable and neared what could be called discriminatory. Smaller rural schools located in the more sparsely populated areas of the state experienced enrollment declines during the 1970's; projections indicate that the declines will continue into the 1970's, but with less severity than in the 1970's. Prepared as a guide for the 1979 session of the Iowa General Assembly, the paper provides national and Iowa perspectives of rural and small schools and presents guidelines and legislative alternatives for Iowa legislative action on "thinking rural", rural school and district organization, financing Iowa's rural schools, a recommended classification system for rural schools with declining enrollment, Iowa's rural teachers, and delivering appropriate services and programs to Iowa's rural schools. Appended is a list of Iowa's rural school districts under 650 enrollment and some examples of various states' policies on sparsity. (BR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

52
81
133

ED165942

REVITALIZING RURAL EDUCATION AND SMALL SCHOOLS IN IOWA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James D. Jess

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Position Paper Prepared for the

House and Senate Education Committee

of the

68TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

First Session

By:

James D. Jess Ed.D.,

Organization Advisor

for

PEOPLE UNITED FOR RURAL EDUCATION

January 25, 1979

RC 011117

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The National Perspective	1
The Iowa Perspective	2
Charateristics of Small-Scale Rural Education in Iowa	2
The Dilemma of Small-Scale Rural Education in Iowa	4
Guidelines for Iowa Legislative Action	5
Thinking Rural	5
Five Basic Guidelines Regarding Rural School Reform	6
Rural School and District Organization	7
Legislative Alternatives	8
Financing Iowa's Rural Schools	9
Legislative Alternatives	10
Recommended Classification System for Rural Schools With Declining Enrollment	12
Iowa's Rural Teachers	13
Legislative Alternatives	14
Delivering Appropriate Services and Programs to Iowa's Rural Schools	15
Legislative Alternatives	15
Appendix	18
District Size Under 300	19
District Sizes 301-375	20
District Sizes 376-450	21
District Sizes 451-525	22
District Sizes 526-625	23
District Size 626-650 & Summaries	24

INTRODUCTION

The National Perspective

During 1976-77 there were 15,891 local public school systems operating in the United States. Forty-two percent or 6,625 school systems were operating with fewer than 600 pupils and 27 percent or 4,344 school systems were operating with fewer than 300 pupils. There were 2,947 school systems in our nation operating K/1-12 programs with fewer than 600 pupils and 1,254 school systems operating K/1-12 programs with fewer than 300 pupils. The number of K/1-12 public school systems that are operating in the United States with fewer than 600 pupils far exceeds the number of school systems that operate in any other size category. Also, there are twice as many K/1-12 school systems operating with fewer than 300 pupils than there are K/1-12 systems operating with more than 10,000 pupils. Nearly all, if not all, of these small K/1-12 school systems are located in rural America.

In thirty-one (31) states, nearly all their public school systems operate on a K/1-12 basis. In another five (5) states, over 80 percent of their public school systems operate on that kind of organizational basis. Only one state, Montana, has no K/1-12 public school systems operating in its state. The remaining thirteen (13) states allow several different types of public school systems to operate in their states. (Examples: K-6, K-8, K-9, K-12, 7-12 and 9-12)

The seven (7) states with the largest number of small K/1-12 public school systems (below 600 or 300 pupils) include: Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan and Minnesota. Four (4) of those states (Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, and Kansas) have provisions in their laws which recognize the special funding needs of small school systems.

Eleven (11) additonal states, likewise, have large numbers of small public school systems operating in their states. In those states, a good number of their schools operate as K/1-12 systems while their other schools operate as either K-6,

K-8, 7-12 or 9-12 systems. Those eleven states include: Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming. Seven (7) states in this group (Nebraska, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, North Dakota, and Wyoming) have included provisions in their laws which recognize the special financial needs of their small public school systems.

Finally, twelve other states with large numbers of rural schools (Arizona, California, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Pennsylvania and Utah) have made special provisions in their laws which recognize the special needs of their smaller enrollment rural schools. In all, 25 of the 50 states have enacted laws which make some effort to correct the inherent differences in rural school costs.

The Iowa Perspective

Iowa ranks 15th among the fifty states in rural population. It ranks 28th in population density per square mile. It ranks 14th in the number of public school systems and it ranks among the top six states with the greatest number of school systems operating K/1-12 programs with fewer than 600 or 300 pupils. In 1977-78 Iowa had 181 K-12 public school systems operating with fewer than 600 pupils and 52 systems operating with fewer than 300 pupils.

Characteristics of Small-Scale Rural Education In Iowa

All of Iowa's smaller school systems are located in the more sparsely populated rural areas of the state. The schools enroll pupils from one or more small communities and the surrounding open countryside. In most instances, a high percentage of the rural school population is furnished bus transporation to and from school. Characteristically, the smaller rural schools have higher than average per pupil assessed valuations and per pupil expenditures. They receive lesser amounts of state aid per pupil which, in turn, causes the districts to make a higher per pupil

local effort. A large percentage of the small rural districts have voter approval for one or more local tax measures (67½% school house levy, 27¢ site levy, and/or additional enrichment provision).

Community support in the smaller schools is generally very high as is student, parent, and teacher satisfaction with the school. The smaller rural schools experience a student holding power that is twice that of the state average. The percentage of small school rural graduates that continue their education or are employed in various occupations after high school graduation exceeds that of the state average.

Employee salary schedules and teacher tenure in the smaller rural schools are generally lower than the state average. The gap in salaries for experienced and higher degreed teachers in the smaller versus the larger districts is becoming appreciable and is nearing what could be called discriminatory.

Rural schools in general and more specifically the smaller rural schools located in the more sparsely populated areas of the state have experienced greater percentages of enrollment declines during the 1970's. Projections indicate that the declines will continue into the 1980's, but with less severity than in the 1970's. As enrollments declined, the schools have made program adjustments to accomodate the decline in revenue growth that they have experienced in recent years. Most small districts now find themselves in a position where they can no longer make any further reductions in their programs as a result of their continued decline in controlled revenue growth. Many of them have put off the purchase of school buses, capital outlay equipment, materials, as well as, making needed repairs and improvements in their programs and facilities.

The Dilemma of Small-Scale Rural Education In Iowa

The small rural schools of Iowa are caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. They have been subjected to a school finance formula that has been designed to accommodate a hypothetical state average school system. The total population of their schools with enrollments of 650 or less amounts to about 15% of the state's total. Consequently, these schools have had little influence on state average computations. The statistics of Iowa's 12 largest school districts have had twice the affect on the formula than has the combined total of these 200 small districts. Likewise, the economic conditions and property values of Iowa's nine most populated counties have had twice the affect on the formula than have all the other 90 counties combined. In the state's quest for equity and equality, which in and of itself is a noble and honorable gesture, the small rural schools have been used statistically like comparing apples with oranges. Unfortunately, few, if any, of the oranges could compare with the apples. When a small rural school is compared individually to a large urban school counterpart, it is likely to be called "inefficient", "inadequate", "inappropriate" and almost "illicit" because its expenditure patterns, valuations, and programs are so different. And why not, one has yet to see an orange that resembles an apple.

The revitalization of rural education and small schools needs to be paramount in the minds of the 68th General Assembly. This paper is being prepared as a guide for legislative action during this 1979 session. It makes use of the information and recommendations found in the resources provided by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, the Iowa Association of School Boards, the National Conference of State Legislatures and the People United for Rural Education.

GUIDELINES FOR IOWA LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The following guidelines were developed, in part, by the National Conference of State Legislatures in cooperation with the National Rural Center. They were adapted to Iowa's situation by using input from resources available from studies conducted by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, the Iowa School Board Association and the People United for Rural Education.

THINKING RURAL

(Definition: For the purpose of definition in this paper, "RURAL SCHOOLS" are defined as those schools which are operating with fewer than 650 students or are schools which lie outside a major Iowa metropolitan city, a county seat town, or nonmetropolitan city having a population of 1,500 or more.

Realizing that a state must look at its educational responsibility from an overall perspective, does not preclude it from looking at recognizable and justifiable differences that exist in different sizes and types of school systems. Iowa is basically a "rural state" whose economy is based on agriculture productivity and agriculturally related industries. With this reliance on agriculture comes a high degree of state dependency on the rural elements of Iowa's sociological, economical and political make up.

Schools tend to reflect the society around them. The State of Iowa is heavily speckled with small towns which lie amid a large portion of its open countryside. Consequently, Iowa, unlike a predominately urban state, is blessed with a large number of small rural schools. Each of these schools is unique in its own right because each, also, reflects the society around it. The differences that exist in our rural schools,today, are the result of tradition, geographic circumstances, political considerations and other local conditions. Although a large proportion of Iowa's local school systems have been eliminated since 1930, one fact remains true even today. Rural Iowans respect and support small-scale community based rural education. If this were not true, voluntary reorganization in Iowa would have been much more widespread than it has been.

Most of the reorganization that has occured in Iowa has been imposed on local communities by state pressures either in the form of increased standards or financial restraints. It is something that has been done to small rural communities, rather than for them. The time has come in Iowa's history, when the people of rural Iowa are saying "what they now have left, they intend to keep!" And, this includes their small-scale rural schools. Therefore, the State must begin thinking in terms of what is good rurally, as well as, what is good for the state system in its entirety.

Five Basic Guidelines Regarding Rural School Reform

1. THE PRIMACY OF LOCAL CIRCUMSTANCES MUST BE RESPECTED.
2. THE LINKAGES BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY MUST BE EXPANDED AND THE BONDS BETWEEN THEM STRENGTHENED.
3. THE BALANCE BETWEEN OUTSIDE REGULATION AND LOCAL CONTROL MUST BECOME MORE EQUITABLE.
4. STRUCTURAL REFORMS AND SUBSTANTIVE REFORMS MUST BE TREATED AS SEPARATE AND DISTINCT ISSUES.
5. REFORM EFFORTS MUST CAPITALIZE UPON THE STRENGTHS, AS WELL AS CORRECT THE DEFICIENCIES OF RURAL SCHOOLS.

RURAL SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

A key attribute of Iowa's rural schools is their relatively limited size and small scale of operations. Unlike small schools elsewhere, small rural schools must contend with unique problems of sparsity and isolation from the governmental, educational, and economic support systems found in county seat towns and metroplitan areas. Moreover, it means that sources of assistance to rural schools (from universities, mental health centers, teacher centers, area education agency centers, community college centers, cultural institutions and other potential resources) are notably absent from their immediate access. Multiple centers provided by some AEAs and community colleges, as well as, delivery services and mobile units have helped eliminate some of the barriers in recent years, but much more needs to be done.

Another factor to consider is that small-school issues (at least in the public domain) will be almost exclusively rural in the State of Iowa. The divisive struggles and intense controversies engendered by school and district consolidation occurred not because of transportation costs, administrative inefficiencies or curricular offerings, or any other technical concerns. Rather, it was (and still is) the battleground on which larger questions of values and control have traditionally been fought out in rural areas. Rural parents and taxpayers are adamant in asserting their ability, and right, to control their schools. Similarly, many rural people have valued having a school in the community more than they have valued the resources educators associated with bigger schools and consolidation. Thus, consolidation is essentially a political issue, rather than an educational or economic one, for it always involves a choice among values, not simply a choice among "objective" facts. After more than 30 years of experience with school and district consolidation, it is clear that consolidation has not lived up to the claims made by its supporters. By and large, the benefits have been exaggerated and the liabilities simply ignored.

Legislative Alternatives

1. PREVENT THE PASSAGE OF ALL MANDATORY CONSOLIDATION OR REORGANIZATION LEGISLATION.
2. ELIMINATE ALL DIRECT AND INDIRECT INCENTIVES TO CONSOLIDATE OR REORGANIZE.
3. ESTABLISH A PROGRAM OF APPROPRIATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL RURAL SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS.
4. CREATE A SPECIAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR SMALL RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS.
5. ENSURE THAT CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO THEIR SMALL RURAL MEMBERS.
6. ALTERNATIVES TO CONSOLIDATION AND REORGANIZATION SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED AND DEVELOPED.

The Iowa Legislature has a unique opportunity--and obligation--to learn from the excesses of the consolidation movement, correct present inequities and assume a leadership role in developing patterns of rural school and district organization which are sensible, appropriate and beneficial to all Iowans.

New legislation which was passed by the 67th General Assembly made significant changes in state policy and the law concerning reorganization. According to the changes in Chapter 275 of the Code, the State's policy no longer encourages nor promotes the reorganization of Iowa school districts. In fact, HF 2359 specifically clarifies the provisions of the law allowing sharing of teachers and facilities so that classes and grades offered jointly by districts meet the requirement for approval of the school district relating to the maintenance of twelve grades. These changes were a breakthrough for small rural communities in their effort to preserve quality programs without having to reorganize their school districts in order to have them.

FINANCING IOWA'S RURAL SCHOOLS

Since the financing of Iowa schools traditionally has been the responsibility of individual communities, the majority of the costs have been borne by the local school district. Only in recent years has the combined state and federal contribution to school expenditures risen to equal the local share on a statewide basis. In 1978-79,public schools in Iowa will receive 49% of their support from state aid and 51% from local levies for their controlled expenditures. Unlike the state average, small rural schools with enrollment below 600 will receive an average of 35% state support and 65% local support. The smallest rural schools with enrollments below 350 will receive only 27% state support while 73% of their support will be raised locally for their controlled expenditures.

Conclusions drawn by the National Conference of State Legislatures are (1) That rural schools are burdened by some unique, and largely unavoidable, financial burdens; (2) That rural schools (particularly small schools in remote areas) have already made major efforts to economize and that any further economy push is likely to be punitive rather than helpful; and, (3) That school consolidation and district reorganization are not likely to solve the financial problems facing rural schools and districts.

As a 16-state review of school finance concluded, in part:

> States with fewer districts exhibit as much disparity in expenditures as those with many districts...states with a small number of districts appear to have as much variation in per-student valuation as states with a large number of districts.

Another conclusion drawn by the National Conference of State Legislatures states:

> To date, it appears that rural districts characterized by low property valuations and low income have been significantly aided by recent school finance reforms. Other kinds of rural districts, such as those found in prosperous farming areas of the Midwest, do not seem to have reaped many appreciable benefits through these reforms.

Declining enrollments in the rural areas of Iowa have caused a disproportionate amount of financial burden on the small rural school district. The burden has been especially heavy laden on the high expenditure, high wealth districts because they did not receive the 125% catch up monies and their percentages of decline were generally higher, thus resulting in little or no growth in their controlled expenditures over the years. In order to keep abreast of their uncontrollable increases in transportation, energy, and fixed costs they have had to cut their instructional and administrative programs more than should have been expected of them.

The 2.5 million dollars appropriated to the School Budget Review Committee by the 67th General Assembly was an appropriate measure in aiding the small districts with declining enrollments who had to terminate educational programs that were benefical to their students. Such an appropriation was necessary during a period when formula changes are being considered, but not yet put in to effect. A provision in the law that recognizes the unique and special financial needs of the small rural districts is needed to assist them in providing quality educational programming on a long term basis.

Legislative Alternatives

Ensuring equity for ruralschools and districts in Iowa requires that legislators be sesitive to the unique financial constraints under which these units operate. As Rachel Tompkins has noted:

> The general policy framework for state school finance should be governed by the goals of adequacy, stability, equity, and flexibility. Each child should be provided with adequate resources to learn, regardless of the child's place of residence. The finance system should provide school districts with predicatable and stable levels of resources. Equity requires that differences in the level of dollars per pupil among districts should be based on differences in the educational needs of children and not on the accidents of property wealth and income level. Finally, finance plans should allow local districts the flexibility to develop educational programs most suitable to community needs.

The rural school finance alternatives which Iowa Legislators should consider are as follows:

1. MAKE SOME PROVISION IN THE LAW TO ACCOMMODATE FOR EXTRAORDINARY ENERGY COSTS, TRANSPORTATION COSTS, AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES.

   (This could be accomplished by opening up the uses of the 67½¢ Schoolhouse levy to include the expenditures for heating and other utility costs, the purchase of school buses, and capital outlay equipment.)

2. ESTABLISH STATE SPARSITY PAYMENTS FOR RURAL SCHOOLS BASED ON POPULATION DENSITY PER SQUARE MILE.

3. ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH REQUIRES NEW STATE MANDATES FOR EDUCATION TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY THE STATE FUNDS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THEM.

4. CREATE A CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS, BY SIZE, FOR DEALING WITH DECLINING ENROLLMENT AND FOR PROVIDING THE NECESSARY FUNDING WHICH IS NECESSARY FOR THE SMALLEST DISTRICTS TO MAINTAIN ADEQUATE PROGRAMS. (Example provided at the end of this section)

5. PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR DEVELOPING SHARED PROGRAMS BETWEEN OR AMONG TWO OR MORE SMALL DISTRICTS.

   (This could be accomplished by weighting students that participate in a shared program. The additional funds would be used for the increased cost of transporting students or teachers, whichever is most appropriate for the program.)

RECOMMENDED CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR RURAL SCHOOLS WITH DECLINING ENROLLMENT:

Recommendation 5 of the State Equalization Study done by the Department of Public Instruction states:

> "When a school district's enrollment decreases to 300 students, it is recommended that enrollments no longer be used as the determinant of the controlled budget. Rather, a budget to budget procedure will be followed whereby the previous year's budget plus the state allowable growth percentage applied to the budget figure will become the budget for the succeeding year.
>
> Further, it is recommended that the School Budget Review Committee retain its authority to respond to 'unusual and unique needs' of individual districts with enrollments slightly above the 300 student cutoff mark.
>
> Finally, it is recomended that all districts which have been below the 300 student mark prior to the date of implementation, request that appropriate DPI staff members review their current budget circumstances to determine reasonable needs to either restore or maintain appropriate programming. Upon recommendation of those staff members, the School Budget Review Committee may make a one-time adjustment to a given school district's budget that puts it "in line" for the budget-to-budget-process."

Recommendation 5 is supported for the same reasons that are outlined in the Problem and Rationale remarks made in the SUMMARY OF STATE EQUALIZATION PROJECT FINDINGS, Iowa Department of Public Instruction

PEOPLE UNITED FOR RURAL EDUCATION would like to see this recommendation expanded to include all districts with enrollments below 325 so that the following Classification System could be followed for school districts experiencing declining enrollments.

CATEGORY	METHOD OF ENSURING ADEQUATE FUNDING & EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
Districts with enrollment below 325	Budget to Budget Procedure
Districts with enrollments of 326-650	65% of Budget Fixed 35% of Budget Tied to Enrollment (Using current provisions for computing enrollment decline)
Districts with enrollment in excess of 650	35% of Budget Fixed 65% of Budget Tied to Enrollment (The Governor's Recommendation)
ALTERNATIVE FOR DISTRICTS ABOVE 650:	
Districts with enrollment of 651-975	50% of Budget Fixed 50% of Budget Tied to Enrollment

IOWA'S RURAL TEACHERS

One clear measure of the disregard accorded to rural teachers in Iowa, as well as the United States, lies in the fact that no one bothers to collect and analyze data on rural teachers. Neither the federal government nor the state or national teachers' organizations has issued a major report on rural teachers in nearly two decades. The problem mentioned most often in regard to rural teachers involves the lower salaries they command. The argument is frequently heard that rural schools will never get their fair share of excellent teachers until they pay wages comparable to those paid in metropolitan communities. In spite of lower salaries paid to teachers in smaller districts, a recent study on teacher satisfaction did not reveal any significant differences in teacher satisfaction with their salaries in the smaller versus larger school districts. Teachers in smaller school districts did express greater satisfaction with their working conditions, specifically with their opportunities for meaningful relationships within their school environment.

A survey of graduates from the University of Northern Iowa who were teaching in small towns their first year out of college revealed that 87% of those who responded would recommend small town or rural teaching to members of future graduating classes. Conclusions drawn from the survey were as follows:

> The majority of the respondents recommended that the important qualities teachers must possess or develop to successfully live and teach in a small town were that they be willing to socialize, take an interest in the community life, and tolerance of a limited social life and slower pace of life.
>
> The graduates offered suggestions for improving the UNI teaching program for rural teachers. The majority suggested student teaching in both large and small school systems, a course in parent and community relationships, more specific methods classes emphasizing skills in classroom improvisation with limited school supplies.
>
> Some of the graduates believe the curriculum should be revised so teachers receive a broader based education since many teach subjects not in their major fields of studies.

The biggest inequity between teacher salaries in the smaller rural districts and the larger Iowa school districts appears to be in the salaries of the more experienced and higher degreed teachers. The smaller rural districts with their limited resources are unable to hold their teachers for any long length of time because of incomparable salary schedules. Another inequity that exists among small rural schools and larger schools is the fact that few students that are training to be teachers are given an opportunity to student teach in the more remote rural districts. Consequently, they are not adequately trained to deal with the problems associated with teaching in a small school district. Problems like multiple preparations, teaching in their minor field, living in a small community, etc. Small schools, therefore, provide a starting place for teachers who are waiting to get into larger school systems for which they were trained to teach in. The same holds true for school administrators.

Legislative Alternatives

1. REQUIRE STATE-SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND GRADUATE SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION TO CREATE SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAMS WHICH WILL EXPLICITLY PREPARE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS FOR SERVICE IN SMALL RURAL SCHOOLS.
2. EXPAND IN-SERVICE TRAINING (AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES) FOR RURAL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS.
3. INCREASE THE VOLUNTARY SHARING OF TEACHERS BETWEEN SCHOOLS IN NEIGHBORING RURAL DISTRICTS.
4. ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH ENCOURAGES THE DEVELOPMENT OF A "COMMUNITY FACULTY" TO COMPLEMENT AND EXTEND THE REGULAR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN RURAL SCHOOLS. (Many small communities have talented citizens that could be used to teach in special areas--this would require a modification of state teacher certification laws to allow this to be done.)

DELIVERING APPROPRIATE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS TO IOWA'S RURAL SCHOOLS

Tom Gjelten in his book, Schooling in Isolated Communities states that there is a pressing need to build a curriculum in rural schools that reflects and enhances the natural advantages of the rural communities being served. He states that rural schools should be encouraged to incorporate into their curriculums:

1. A strong foundation in the teaching of basic skills and essential facts.
2. An emphasis on practical skills and learning by doing.
3. Training in self-directed study and the development of initiative.
4. A focus on the local rural community.
5. A commitment to familarizing students with the outside world.
6. An emphasis on the options available to rural youths both within and beyond the local community.

So much emphasis is directed in the curriculums of Iowa's small rural schools toward preparing their students to leave their local communities that few graduates have learned the value of returning to their local communities to help them grow and develop. Commercial textbook companies gear their materials toward an urban culture and society and the state agencies are not equipped to help rural schools to develop locally oriented curriculum materials.

Legislative Alternatives

1. REVISE ANY STATE EDUCATION REGULATIONS AND MANDATES WHICH UNNECESSARILY RESTRICT LOCAL FLEXIBILITY IN THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION SERVICES.
2. CREATE AN OFFICE OF RURAL EDUCATION WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION. (Two states have already done so: Texas and Oregon)

3. ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH PROVIDES FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROPRIATE CURRICULAR MATERIALS FOR RURAL SCHOOLS.
4. ENCOURAGE THE SHARING OF RESOURCES AMONG RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS.
5. ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE DELIVERY OF RURAL EDUCATION SERVICES.
6. ENCOURAGE THE AREA EDUCATIONAL EDUCATION AGENCIES TO USE THEIR OTHER EDUCATION SERVICES MONEY TO ASSIST SMALL RURAL SCHOOLS DEVELOP SHARED PROGRAMS. (This may necessitate additional funds to be generated for this purpose.)
7. ENCOURAGE THE AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO DEVELOP COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN SATELITE CENTERS THROUGHOUT THEIR RURAL AREAS.
8. ENCOURAGE STATE-SUPPORTED UNIVERSITIES AND PRIVATE COLLEGES TO WORK WITH SMALL RURAL SCHOOLS IN AREAS OF IN-SERVICE AND CURRICULUM MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT.
9. ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD REQUIRE A "RURAL ADVISORY GROUP" WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION. (As outlined in the Iowa Association of school board recommendations: "to collect and share information about educationally sound and workable ways to maintain quality of instruction and suitable curriculum in rural school districts. The group would offer consulting services, on request, to local districts. Personnel should have a background on rural school boards as well as in the teaching profession or administration.") Lay citizen and student participation should also be included.
10. GIVE LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT TO A NEWLY CREATED "CENTER FOR RURAL EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT." (A non-profit research,

consultant, and information center providing resource information and technical assistance to small rural communities in areas of needs assessment, educational planning, evaluation, grantsmandship, in-service training, and school/community development.

The center acts as a catalytic agent in bringing representatives from local communities, colleges and universities, professional and lay organizations, government and non-governmental agencies together to work cooperatively for the improvement of America's small rural schools and communities.

APPENDIX
IOWA RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS UNDER 650 ENROLLMENT

DISTRICT SIZE: Under 300	77-78 ADM	77-78 CRS COST PER/PL	78-79 TOTAL AID (PER/PL)	78-79 TOTAL LEVY (PER/PL)
1. Prescott Community	213.	$ 1804	$ 126,017 ($550)	$ 281,042 ($1227)
2. Grand Community	240	1562	71,885 ($264)	349,468 ($1285)
3. Sioux Rapids Community	283	1656	178,683 ($594)	315,036 ($1047)
4. Rembrandt Consolidated	123*	1790	47,149 ($332)	204,296 ($1439)
5. Dumont Community	266	1590	175,674 ($584)	292,965 ($ 973)
6. Lohrville Community	249	1739	53,000 ($200)	403,205 ($1522)
7. Lytton Community	250	1755	63,051 ($236)	394,030 ($1476)
8. Meservey-Thornton Community	261	1637	72,855 ($254)	394,139 ($1373)
9. Sioux Valley Community	284	1595	69,150 ($238)	383,617 ($1318)
10. Lincoln Central Community	280	1755	58,400 ($200)	477,832 ($1534)
11. Ringsted Community	202*	1754	48,200 ($200)	368,309 ($1528)
12. Bayard Community	257	1749	127,681 ($469)	341,774 ($1257)
13. Kanawha Community	275	1703	75,356 ($242)	453,587 ($1454)
14. Klemme Community	249	1633	110,301 ($378)	262,563 ($1242)
15. Woden-Crystal Lake Community	265	1719	123,243 ($408)	391,872 ($1298)
16. New Providence Community	174	1684	79,619 ($394)	253,201 ($1253)
17. Steamboat Rock Community	166	1790	73,208 ($421)	233,860 ($1344)
18. Boone Valley Community	254	1833	57,400 ($200)	463,716 ($1616)
19. Galva Community	194	1840	44,646 ($214)	329,837 ($1578)
20. Deep River-Millersburg	275	1669	243,074 ($730)	303,167 ($ 910)
21. Mingo Community	293	1549	242,535 ($765)	244,957 ($ 773)
22. Oxford Junction Consolidated	245	1717	193,597 ($750)	239,220 ($ 927)
23. Hedrick Community	299	1566	210,303 ($670)	278,624 ($ 887)
24. Burt Community	257	1616	134,606 ($506)	292,811 ($1101)
25. Lakota Consolidated	176	1861	42,016 ($208)	330,264 ($1635)
26. LuVerne Community	213	1789	36,900 ($148)	391,790 ($1573)
27. Morning Sun Community	267	1655	222,861 ($721)	285,655 ($ 924)
28. Russell Community	256	1549	206,429 ($737)	222,713 ($ 795)
29. Little Rock Community	270	1600	182,369 ($606)	293,395 ($ 975)
30. Fremont Community	215	1660	138,747 ($571)	261,547 ($1076)
31. Green Mountain Independent	255	1685	160,464 ($597)	287,160 ($1063)
32. East Monona Community	280	1854	131,973 ($485)	370,367 ($1285)
33. Whiting Community	278	1639	95,891 ($325)	368,154 ($1309)
34. Melvin Community	149	1823	32,000 ($200)	247,928 ($1515)
35. Ocheyedan Community	226	1765	101,864 ($407)	328,622 ($1314)
36. Ayrshire Consolidated	231	1587	106,519 ($430)	284,432 ($1147)
37. Mallard Community	265	1643	86,273 ($294)	390,045 ($1331)
38. Ruthven Consolidated	268	1581	143,222 ($512)	324,019 ($1157)
39. Westfield Community	289	1549	284,003 ($809)	255,616 ($ 728)
40. Fonda Community	254	1769	66,416 ($225)	451,589 ($1531)
41. Havelock-Plover Community	231	1691	68,018 ($283)	329,062 ($1371)
42. Palmer Consolidated	194	1781	75,730 ($359)	295,758 ($1402)
43. Diagonal Community	181	1646	145,171 ($682)	198,696 ($ 933)
44. Grand Valley Community	268	1631	176,732 ($605)	287,058 ($ 983)
45. Collins Community	185	1618	53,350 ($293)	238,326 ($1309)
46. Clearfield Community	132	1815	64,857 ($424)	207,910 ($1359)
47. New Market Community	286	1632	210,972 ($701)	272,519 ($ 905)
48. Fox Valley Community	272	1639	208,838 ($692)	277,038 ($ 920)
49. A.C.L. Community	154	1784	92,470 ($560)	193,448 ($1172)
50. Goldfield Community	215	1678	88,923 ($380)	301,369 ($1288)
51. Ledyard	177*	1672	60,066 ($308)	262,774 ($1348)
52. Rake	160*	1746	65,443 ($412)	210,486 ($1324)
UNDER 300 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	12,201			
UNDER 300 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(2.11%)			
AVERAGES OF UNDER 300 DISTRICTS	234.7	$1693.30	$5,874,284($483.10)	$16,121,568($1321.33)

*have since consolidated

DISTRICT SIZE: 301-325	77-78 ADM	77-78 CRS COST PER/PL	78-79 TOTAL AID (PER/PL)	78-79 TOTAL LEVY (PER/PL)
1. Lost Nation Community	302	$1632	$ 272,913 ($738)	$ 323,217 ($ 874)
2. Central Dallas Community	313	1681	100,610 ($281)	496,550 ($1387)
3. Arnolds Park Consolidated	315	1552	111,586 ($323)	418,429 ($1213)
4. CAL Community	305	1831	73,000 ($200)	587,120 ($1609)
5. Scranton Consolidated	323	1657	161,890 ($461)	416,735 ($1187)
6. Wellsburg Community	320	1591	123,504 ($336)	456,997 ($1242)
7. Hubbard Community	316	1662	100,135 ($286)	471,520 ($1347)
8. Union-Whitten Community	311	1695	200,163 ($570)	389,147 ($1109)
9. Battle Creek Community	318	1645	211,379 ($602)	350,630 ($ 999)
10. Amana Community	310	1729	176,813 ($510)	415,698 ($1198)
11. Primghar Community	305	1628	154,628 ($489)	355,874 ($1126)
12. Crestland Community	317	1750	63,200 ($200)	475,858 ($1506)
13. Colo Community	324	1640	109,983 ($526)	403,038 ($1110)
14. Garwin Community	309	1630	247,653 ($731)	299,832 ($ 884)
15. Blakesburg Community	318	1551	321,638 ($916)	216,094 ($ 616)
16. Thompson Community	301	1674	122,874 ($377)	417,759 ($1281)
17. Walnut	309	1646	154,028 ($461)	374,922 ($1123)
301-325 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	5,316			
301-325 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.92%)			
AVERAGES FOR 301-325 DISTRICTS	312.7	$1659	$2,786,997 ($524)	$6,869,420 ($1292)
DISTRICT SIZE: 326-350				
1. Urbana Community	340	1555	330,077 ($902)	235,668 ($ 644)
2. Cedar Valley Community	346	1873	158,193 ($414)	552,257 ($1446)
3. Meriden-Cleghorn Community	331	1638	158,199 ($429)	422,160 ($1144)
4. Calamus Community	329	1588	275,406 ($717)	327,987 ($ 854)
5. Terril Community	337	1780	97,378 ($273)	530,043 ($1485)
6. Stratford Community	331	1554	213,504 ($596)	340,510 ($ 951)
7. Stanton Community	334	1626	261,464 ($722)	307,939 ($ 851)
8. Sanborn Community	328	1573	191,964 ($541)	358,658 ($1010)
9. Essex Community	334	1587	218,073 ($582)	367,141 ($ 979)
10. Rolfe Community	344	1681	167,292 ($446)	454,270 ($1211)
11. Schaller Community	334	1643	215,177 ($585)	382,884 ($1040)
12. Dows Community	326	1827	88,172 ($258)	529,372 ($1548)
13. Murray Community	330	1551	242,943 ($692)	297,010 ($ 846)
14. Corwith-Wesley Community	348	1723	125,724 ($312)	565,349 ($1403)
15. Swea City	348*	1680	100,503 ($225)	643,571 ($1440)
16. Maxwell	347	1629	242,549 ($654)	359,836 ($ 970)
17. Wall Lake	348	1642	230,229 ($603)	386,819 ($1013)
326-350 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	5,735			
326-350 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.99%)			
AVERAGES FOR 325-350 DISTRICTS	337.4	$1656	$3,316,847 ($578)	$7,061,474 ($1231)
DISTRICT SIZE: 351-375				
1. Newell-Providence	361	1653	166,898 ($424)	475,089 ($1206)
2. Pomroy	367	1587	182,098 ($462)	435,964 ($1107)
3. South Clay	354	1746	159,912 ($418)	501,175 ($1309)
4. Dow City-Arion	362	1638	324,516 ($784)	348,204 ($ 841)
5. Fayette	363	1650	357,552 ($894)	296,019 ($ 740)
6. Paton-Churdan	370	1740	116,175 ($277)	610,352 ($1453)
7. Yale-Jamaica-Bagley	375	1636	190,637 ($457)	487,779 ($1170)
8. Titonka	351	1640	169,206 ($438)	457,295 ($1185)
9. Dayton	353	1642	226,185 ($600)	383,971 ($1018)
351-375 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	3,256			
351-375 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.56%)			
AVERAGES FOR 351-375 DISTRICTS	361.8	$1659	$1,893,179 ($581)	$3,995,848 ($1227)

DISTRICT SIZE: 376-400	77-78 ADM	77-78 CRS COST PER/PL	78-79 TOTAL AID (PER/PL)	78-79 TOTAL LEVY (PER/PL)
1. Orient-Macksburg	395	$1745	$172,257 ($392)	$569,895 ($1310)
2. Moulton-Udell	395	1551	322,217 ($751)	334,090 ($ 779)
3. United Community	393	1690	85,000 ($200)	628,627 ($1479)
4. Plainfield	392	1548	334,987 ($777)	328,075 ($ 761)
5. Clay Central	391	1698	142,058 ($334)	566,541 ($1333)
6. Everly	392	1696	169,399 ($385)	561,130 ($1275)
7. Radcliffe	384	1801	71,728 ($178)	630,297 ($1560)
8. Gilmore City-Bradgate	377	1696	187,641 ($438)	531,400 ($1242)
9. Baxter	391	1639	321,798 ($761)	365,023 ($ 863)
10. Sentral	380	1682	80,749 ($201)	588,904 ($1469)
11. West Bend	394	1822	167,237 ($384)	619,757 ($1421)
12. Irwin	387	1600	210,045 ($503)	444,745 ($1064)
13. Nesco	381	1714	119,507 ($287)	599,929 ($1439)
14. Gladbrook	397	1626	193,866 ($466)	473,437 ($1138)
15. Willow Community	378	1641	250,087 ($621)	390,582 ($ 969)
376-400 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	5,827			
376-400 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(1.01%)			
AVERAGES FOR 376-400 DISTRICTS	388.5	$1677	$2,828,776 ($485)	$7,932,432 ($1361)
DISTRICT SIZE: 401-425				
1. Bridgewater-Fontanelle	418	1552	301,082 ($652)	403,337 ($ 873)
2. C & M Community	407	1645	290,557 ($641)	443,313 ($ 979)
3. Bennett	402	1680	279,144 ($643)	437,416 ($1008)
4. Ventura	406	1728	118,455 ($274)	624,975 ($1447)
5. Wheatland	416	1557	335,320 ($785)	319,074 ($ 747)
6. Van Meter	408	1643	331,566 ($786)	358,443 ($ 849)
7. Harris-Lake Park	424	1727	143,655 ($314)	627,090 ($1372)
8. Winfield-Mt. Union	410	1798	170,137 ($376)	636,783 ($1409)
9. Twin Rivers	410	1861	175,895 ($394)	647,100 ($1451)
10. Olin Consolidated	415	1631	307,870 ($698)	393,357 ($ 892)
11. Carson-Macedonia	424	1622	257,936 ($573)	453,456 ($1008)
12. Elk Horn-Kimballton	412	1552	312,094 ($684)	379,627 ($ 833)
13. Shelby	408	1550	251,434 ($616)	370,103 ($ 907)
14. Central Webster	407	1667	250,603 ($553)	503,463 ($1111)
15. Northwest Webster	405	1702	149,344 ($308)	672,069 ($1386)
401-425 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	6,172			
401-425 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(1.07%)			
AVERAGES FOR 401-425 DISTRICTS	411.5	$1661	$3,675,092 ($595)	$7,269,606 ($1178)
DISTRICT SIZE: 426-450				
1. Moravia	430	1551	359,864 ($754)	372,881 ($ 782)
2. Norway	442	1693	358,521 ($764)	429,590 ($ 916)
3. Albert City-Truesdale	446	1646	116,746 ($345)	619,708 ($1283)
4. Garnavillo	444	1698	369,529 ($757)	449,563 ($ 921)
5. Lamoni	435	1632	391,772 ($814)	386,633 ($ 604)
6. Farragut	447	1793	190,999 ($404)	645,878 ($1365)
7. N.E. Hamilton	432	1799	96,020 ($200)	761,768 ($1587)
8. Prairie City	428	1612	285,612 ($604)	467,181 ($ 988)
9. Keota	445	1721	122,688 ($248)	716,982 ($1451)
10. Malvern	432	1668	216,000 ($446)	578,859 ($1196)
11. South Page	434	1651	336,228 ($675)	472,977 ($ 950)
12. Graettinger	444	1584	322,995 ($663)	443,675 ($ 911)
13. Buffalo Center	445	1589	226,306 ($484)	514,457 ($1099)
14. Paulina	445	1618	159,331 ($319)	619,162 ($1241)
426-450 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	6,149			
426-450 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(1.06%)			
AVERAGES FOR 426-450 DISTRICTS	439.2	$1661	$3,552,591 ($578)	$7,479,314 ($1216)

DISTRICT SIZE: 451-475	77-78 ADM	77-78 CRS COST PER/PL	78-79 TOTAL AID (PER/PL)	78-79 TOTAL LEVY (PER/PL)
1. Shellsburg	469	$1550	$434,039 ($868)	$324,669 ($ 649)
2. Mar-Mac	461	1560	492,932 ($976)	293,773 ($ 576)
3. Delwood	460	1562	404,726 ($792)	376,004 ($ 736)
4. Ar We Va	454	1654	178,452 ($341)	366,603 ($1275)
5. Manilla	467	1567	364,078 ($710)	428,905 ($ 836)
6. Alden	463	1677	199,079 ($401)	625,722 ($1262)
7. Andrew	472	1548	454,837 ($873)	341,419 ($ 655)
8. Lone Tree	472	1620	304,684 ($606)	503,680 ($1001)
9. Semco	463	1646	319,898 ($632)	505,426 ($ 999)
10. Nishna Valley	456	1858	198,552 ($412)	677,673 ($1406)
11. Floyd Valley	457	1780	121,063 ($235)	764,370 ($1484)
12. Lenox	459	1582	299,745 ($595)	488,915 ($ 970)
13. Anthon-Oto	458	1648	287,318 ($577)	511,404 ($1027)
14. New Hartford	463	1547	442,387 ($892)	322,557 ($ 650)
451-475 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	6,474			
451-475 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(1.12%)			
AVERAGES FOR 451-475 DISTRICTS	462.4	$1629	$4,501,943 ($695)	$6,631,120 ($1024)
DISTRICT SIZE: 476-500				
1. Glidden-Ralston	493	1645	295,564 ($545)	582,046 ($1074)
2. Fredricksburg	499	1559	377,281 ($744)	404,177 ($ 799)
3. Schleswig	484	1623	282,062 ($541)	541,149 ($1039)
4. Hamburg	493	1728	336,756 ($625)	590,747 ($1096)
5. Holstein	480	1619	249,271 ($491)	542,861 ($1069)
6. Tri-County	485	1638	334,423 ($597)	569,009 ($1016)
7. Sutherland	486	1646	278,335 ($551)	532,795 ($1055)
8. Seymour	492	1551	338,188 ($626)	488,396 ($ 904)
9. Eastwood Community	483	1624	349,027 ($645)	514,377 ($ 951)
476-500 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	4,395			
476-500 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.76%)			
AVERAGES FOR 476-500 DISTRICTS	488.3	$1626	$2,840,907 ($646)	$4,765,557 ($1084)
DISTRICT SIZE: 501-525				
1. Exira	509	1660	326,491 ($602)	553,777 ($1022)
2. Applington	515	1548	349,313 ($655)	468,338 ($ 879)
3. Aurelia	511	1644	254,277 ($447)	655,202 ($1151)
4. Armstrong	517	1605	327,909 ($576)	576,124 ($1013)
5. Sheffield-Chapin	502	1665	290,758 ($525)	623,660 ($1126)
6. Fremont-Mills	507	1640	265,474 ($488)	616,838 ($1134)
7. Sidney	501	1670	277,223 ($522)	603,273 ($1136)
8. East Greene	506	1606	205,939 ($372)	678,001 ($1224)
9. Villisca	525	1640	399,383 ($673)	555,365 ($ 937)
10. Akron	525	1614	412,861 ($719)	501,910 ($ 874)
11. Remsen-Union	504	1652	109,200 ($200)	774,884 ($1419)
12. Treynor	519	1633	379,731 ($679)	507,514 ($ 908)
13. North Winneshiek	515	1563	461,301 ($803)	393,098 ($ 707)
501-525 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	6,656			
501-525 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(1.15%)			
AVERAGES OF 501-525 DISTRICTS	512.0	$1626	$4,059,860 ($610)	$7,507,984 ($1128)

DISTRICT SIZE: 526-550	77-78 ADM	77-78 CRS COST PER/PL	78-79 TOTAL AID (PER/PL)	78-79 TOTAL LEVY (PER/PL)
1. Anita	534	$1550	$419,290 ($733)	$457,139 ($ 799)
2. Rockwell-Swaledale	542	1565	293,444 ($524)	579,044 ($1034)
3. Charter Oak-Ute	542	1630	345,983 ($604)	563,780 ($ 984)
4. Morman Trails	539	1552	354,267 ($626)	511,572 ($ 904)
5. Adair-Casey	545	1557	378,894 ($633)	542,374 ($ 905)
6. Panora-Linden	547	1636	369,993 ($632)	583,695 ($ 998)
7. Dunlop	544	1543	481,347 ($793)	447,617 ($ 737)
8. Lisbon	549	1555	531,265 ($897)	385,756 ($ 652)
9. George	545	1552	347,348 ($592)	550,336 ($ 938)
526-550 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	4,887			
526-550 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.85%)			
AVERAGES FOR 526-550 DISTRICTS	543	$1571	$3,521,831 ($720)	$4,621,313 ($ 946)
DISTRICT SIZE: 551-575				
1. Allison-Bristow	554	1640	432,101 ($721)	541,672 ($ 904)
2. Clarksville	573	1552	513,659 ($853)	413,541 ($ 687)
3. English Valley	566	1641	404,611 ($657)	593,739 ($ 964)
4. HLV Community	557	1641	393,405 ($648)	587,006 ($ 967)
5. Earlham	566	1634	418,131 ($682)	574,270 ($ 937)
6. Melcher-Dallas	557	1586	570,240 ($946)	380,672 ($ 631)
7. Hartley	573	1559	290,949 ($455)	687,566 ($1076)
8. Lakeview-Auburn	560	1578	352,090 ($609)	536,633 ($ 928)
551-575 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	4,506			
551-575 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.78%)			
AVERAGES FOR 551-575 DISTRICTS	563.3	$1604	$3,375,186 ($749)	$4,315,099 ($ 958)
DISTRICT SIZE: 576-600				
1. Coon Rapids	590	1647	453,525 ($710)	591,914 ($ 926)
2. Clarence Lowden	578	1649	369,485 ($600)	627,192 ($1018)
3. West Central	577	1630	412,768 ($657)	601,359 ($ 958)
4. Midland	581	1656	507,824 ($775)	562,735 ($ 859)
5. Hinton	597	1606	415,417 ($655)	582,398 ($ 919)
6. Oakland	590	1551	289,904 ($454)	662,637 ($1039)
7. Martinsdale-St. Marys	589	1552	530,809 ($853)	423,420 ($ 681)
8. Beaman-Conrad	593	1655	272,395 ($428)	775,487 ($1219)
9. Greene	577	1544	419,321 ($660)	617,340 ($ 972)
576-600 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	5,272			
576-600 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.91%)			
AVERAGES FOR 576-600 DISTRICTS	585.8	$1621	$3,671,448 ($818)	$5,454,482 ($1035)
DISTRICT SIZE: 601-625				
1. Marcus	622	1613	313,276 ($470)	724,803 ($1088)
2. Danville	604	1613	511,471 ($792)	524,218 ($ 811)
3. West Burlington	609	1562	510,431 ($788)	530,819 ($ 774)
4. Preston	620	1547	632,461 ($925)	414,110 ($ 605)
5. Lynnville Sully	623	1614	402,343 ($590)	677,816 ($ 994)
6. North Mahaska	613	1733	358,348 ($537)	775,024 ($1162)
7. LDF	603	1627	529,244 ($803)	536,299 ($ 814)
8. Avoka	617	1552	450,178 ($700)	534,995 ($ 832)
9. Odebolt Arthur	601	1591	304,902 ($474)	686,945 ($1068)
10. Boyden Hull	619	1610	333,055 ($481)	757,610 ($1095)
11. Gilbert	615	1591	551,577 ($814)	524,112 ($ 773)
12. Harmony	614	1571	528,190 ($788)	517,715 ($ 773)
13. Woodbury	608	1640	402,873 ($636)	613,616 ($ 969)
601-625 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	7,968			
601-625 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(1.38%)			
AVERAGES FOR 601-625 DISTRICTS	612.9	$1605	$5,858,349 ($735)	$7,818,083 ($ 981)

DISTRICT SIZE: 626-650	77-78 ADM	77-78 CRS COST PER/PL	78-79 TOTAL AID (PER/PL)	78-79 TOTAL LEVY (PER/PL)
1. Madrid	635	$1629	$621,830 ($887)	$578,081 ($ 739)
2. Janesville	635	1549	641,616 ($944)	408,838 ($ 601)
3. Parkersburg	626	1559	449,963 ($755)	524,822 ($ 793)
4. Dexfield	636	1686	427,978 ($625)	723,181 ($1056)
5. Waco	650	1755	443,259 ($631)	776,236 ($1104)
6. Kingsley-Pierson	649	1646	431,586 ($611)	702,876 ($ 996)
626-650 TOTAL ENROLLMENT	3,831			
626-650 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(.66%)			
AVERAGES FOR 626-650 DISTRICTS	638.5	$1637	$3,016,232 ($787)	$3,714,034 ($ 969)
TOTAL ADM ENROLLMENT BELOW 650	88,645			
UNDER 650 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(15.3%)			
AVERAGES OF BELOW 650 DISTRICTS	401.1	$1652	$54,793,522 ($618)	$101,557,334 ($1146)
TOTAL ADM ENROLLMENT BELOW 325	17,517			
UNDER 325 % OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(3.0%)			
AVERAGES OF BELOW 325 DISTRICTS	253.9	$1808	$8,681,281 ($496)	$22,990,988 ($1313)
TOTAL ADM ENROLLMENT FOR STATE	578,450			
& OF STATE ENROLLMENT	(100.0%)			
AVERAGES FOR STATE	1,294.1	$1590	$485,740,036 ($774)	$505,784,440 ($ 806)

RURAL DISTRICTS UNDER 350:
HAVE 3.03% OF TOTAL STATE ENROLLMENT
RECEIVE 1.79% OF TOTAL STATE AID
PAY 4.56% OF TOTAL STATE LEVY

RURAL DISTRICTS UNDER 650:
HAVE 15.32% OF TOTAL STATE ENROLLMENT
RECEIVE 11.28% OF TOTAL STATE AID
PAY 20.08% OF TOTAL STATE LEVY

RURAL DISTRICTS BELOW 350:
RECEIVE 27.4% STATE SUPPORT and 72.6% LOCAL LEVY SUPPORT

RURAL DISTRICTS BELOW 600:
RECEIVE 35.1% STATE SUPPORT and 64.9% LOCAL LEVY SUPPORT

STATE TOTAL:
RECEIVES 49% STATE SUPPORT and 51% LOCAL LEVY SUPPORT

SOURCES

REVIALIZING RURAL EDUCATION: A LEGISLATOR'S HANDBOOK
Jonathan P. Sher, Education Director National Rural Center
Washington D.C.
Legislators' Education Action Project, National Conference of State Legislatuures
September, 1978

RURAL EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT 1976-78
Iowa Association of School Boards
Des Moines, Iowa
November 16, 1978

SUMMARY OF STATE EQUALIZATION PROJECT FINDINGS
Iowa Department of Public Instruction
State Equalization Plan Division
Des Moines, Iowa

IOWA PUBLIC SCHOOL DATA 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR
Department of Public Instruction
Administration and Finance Division
Des Moines, Iowa

EDUCATION DIRECTORY. PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS, 1976-77
Jeffrey W. Williams and Sallie L. Warf
Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Education Division
National Center for Education Statistics, 1977

COMPUTER PRINTOUT 2/10/78 PROJECTED VALUATIONS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1978-79
State Comptroller's Office
Des Moines, Iowa

QUALITY, EQUITY, EFFICIENCY, EVALUATION, AND LOCAL FLEXIBILITY: THE POLITICAL AND EDUCATIONAL DILEMMAS OF IOWA'S FOUNDATION PLAN
James D. Jess
University Microfilms International, Dissertation Copies, PO Box 1764
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

EXAMPLES OF STATE POLICY ON SPARSITY

IDAHO combines both sparsity and scale factors. If an elementary school is more than 10 miles from another elementary school, or if a secondary school is more than 15 miles from another secondary school, the average daily attendance (the basis for the state aid) is increased inversely with size. For example, for state aid purposes, an elementary school with between 200 and 299 pupils would be increased by 10 percent while the enrollment of a school with 50 to 100 students would be given a multiplier of 25 percent.

MONTANA establishes a per-pupil expenditure that varies with school size (e.g., for an elementary school of 50 students, the guaranteed amount would be $836 per pupil, and for a school of 350, it would be $639 per pupil). The state provides what the statewide property tax does not raise.

NEBRASKA increases the per-pupil support according to population density, as follows:

Density	Percent State Aid Added
3-4 per square mile	10%
2-3 per square mile	20%
1-2 per square mile	30%
Less than 1	40%

NEW MEXICO employs linear formulae both for schools with fewer than 200 students and for districts with fewer than 4,000 students. The add-on is used to increase the attendance figure that is used to calculate state aid. For example, the enrollment multiplier for an elementary school is (1-enrollment/200) and the corresponding multiplier for a district is (1-enrollment/4,000) x .15.

UTAH uses a table to choose the weight given for school size. Assuming that the schools are considered to be necessarily small, assistance is given to compensate for diseconomies of scale.

COLORADO assigns "bonus pupils" to small attendance centers according to tables established by the state. These centers must be a specified number of miles from other schools to qualify.

MAINE uses geographic isolation grants to adjust the per-pupil allocation.